arXiv:1111.4568v1 [math.FA] 19 Nov 2011

Schrödinger operators with boundary singularities: Hardy inequality, Pohozaev identity and controllability results

Cristian Cazacu [*][†]

November 22, 2011

Abstract

The aim of this paper is two folded. Firstly, we study the validity of the Pohozaev-type identity for the Schrödinger operator

$$A_\lambda := -\Delta - \frac{\lambda}{|x|^2}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R},$$

in the situation where the origin is located on the boundary of a smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$. The problem we address is very much related to optimal Hardy-Poincaré inequality with boundary singularities which has been investigated in the recent past in various papers. In view of that, the proper functional framework is described and explained.

Secondly, we apply the Pohozaev identity not only to study semi-linear elliptic equations but also to derive the method of multipliers in order to study the exact boundary controllability of the wave and Schrödinger equations corresponding to the singular operator A_λ. In particular, this complements and extends well known results by Vanconstenoble and Zuazua [34], who discussed the same issue in the case of interior singularity.

Contents

1 **Introduction** 2

2 **Pohozaev identity for A_λ** 6

- 2.1 The case C1 6
  - 2.1.1 The meaning of H_λ-norm 7
  - 2.1.2 Main results 7
  - 2.1.3 Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2 9
  - 2.1.4 Proofs of useful lemmas 11
- 2.2 Applications to semi-linear equations 14
- 2.3 Brief presentation of the case C2 17
  - 2.3.1 Functional framework via Hardy inequality 17
  - 2.3.2 The meaning of the H_λ-norm 18

---

[*] BCAM - Basque Center for Applied Mathematics, Bizkaia Technology Park 500, 48160, Derio, Basque Country, Spain

[†] Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid 28049, Spain.

3 Applications to Controllability **19**
3.1 The wave equation. Case C1 19
3.1.1 Well-posedness 19
3.1.2 Controllability and main results 20
3.1.3 Proofs of main results 22
3.2 The Schrödinger equation 24

4 Open problems **26**

5 Appendix: sharp bounds for $||x \cdot \nabla v(t)||_{L^2(\Omega)}$ **26**

1 Introduction

In this paper we are dealing with the Schrödinger operator $A_\lambda := -\Delta - \lambda/|x|^2$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, acting in a domain where the potential $1/|x|^2$ is singular at the boundary. Our main goal consists to study the control properties of the corresponding wave and Schrödinger equations. Moreover, we are aimed to give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of non-trivial solutions to semi-linear elliptic equations associated to A_λ. Operators like A_λ may arise in molecular physics [26], quantum cosmology [5], combustion models [20] but also in the linearization of critical nonlinear PDE's playing a crucial role in the asymptotic behaviour of branches of solutions in bifurcation problems (e.g. [8], [30]). From the mathematical view point they are interesting due to their criticality since they are homogeneous of degree -2.

The qualitative properties of evolution problems involving the operator A_λ require either positivity or coercivity of A_λ in the sense of quadratic forms in L^2. Roughly speaking, this is equivalent to make use of Hardy-type inequalities. There is a large literature concerning the study of such inequalities, especially in the context of interior singularities (e.g. see [36], [2], [17] and references therein). The classical Hardy inequality is stated as follows. Assume Ω is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$, containing the origin, i.e., $0 \in \Omega$; then it follows (see [22])

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{(N-2)^2}{4} \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx > 0, \quad \forall u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \tag{1.1}$$

and the constant $(N-2)^2/4$ is optimal and not attained. We remind that the optimal Hardy constant is defined by the quotient

$$\mu(\Omega) := \inf_{u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)} \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx / \int_\Omega u^2/|x|^2 dx \Big).$$

In this paper, we consider Ω to be a smooth subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, with the origin $x = 0$ placed on its boundary Γ. Hardy inequalities with an isolated singularity on the boundary were less investigated so far. However, in the recent past some substantial work has been developed in that direction.

It has been proved that, the best constants depends both on the local geometry near the origin and the entire shape of the domain.

More precisely, starting with the work by Filippas, Tertikas and Tidblom [19], and continuing with [9], [14], [15], it has been proved that, whenever Ω is a smooth domain with the origin located on the boundary, there exists a positive constant $r_0 = r_0(\Omega, N) > 0$ such that

$$\mu(\Omega \cap B_{r_0}(0)) = \frac{N^2}{4}. \tag{1.2}$$

where $B_{r_0}(0)$ denotes the N-d ball of radius r_0 centered at origin. Next we recall the definition of the upper half space $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ which is given by the set $\mathbb{R}^N_+ := \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}, x_N) = (x', x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \times \mathbb{R} \mid x_N > 0\}$. In addition, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N_+$, $N \geq 1$, the new Hardy inequality

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx \geq \frac{N^2}{4} \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx \quad \forall \quad u \in H^1_0(\Omega). \tag{1.3}$$

holds true and the constant $N^2/4$ is optimal i.e. $\mu(\Omega) = N^2/4$.

Otherwise, if Ω is a smooth domain which, up to a rotation, is not supported in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$, the constant $N^2/4$ is optimal, up to lower order terms in $L^2(\Omega)$-norm as shown later in inequality (1.7). In general $\mu(\Omega) = N^2/4$ is not true for any smooth bounded domain Ω containing the origin on the boundary (e.g. [14]).

Without losing the generality, since the operator A_λ is invariant under rotations, next we consider Ω such that

$$x \cdot \nu = O(|x|^2), \text{ on } \Gamma, \tag{1.4}$$

where ν stands for the outward normal vector to Γ. Moreover, since optimal inequalities have been obtained regardless the shape of Ω, throughout the paper we discuss two main situations of geometries motivated by the remarks above.

C1. Ω is a smooth domain satisfying (1.4) and $x_N > 0$ holds for all $x \in \Omega$ (i.e. $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N_+$).

C2. Ω is a smooth domain satisfying (1.4) such that x_N changes sign in Ω ($\Omega \not\subset \mathbb{R}^N_+$).

Next we need to introduce the constant

$$R_\Omega = \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |x|. \tag{1.5}$$

The following optimal Hardy-Poincaré inequalities are valid for each one of the cases above.

If Ω fulfills the case C1, then (e.g. [9]) it holds that

$$\forall\ u \in C^\infty_0(\Omega), \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx \geq \frac{N^2}{4} \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx + \frac{1}{4} \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2 \log^2(R_\Omega/|x|)} dx, \tag{1.6}$$

and $N^2/4$ is the sharp constant.

If Ω satisfies the case C2 then (e.g. [14]) there exist two constants $C_2 = C_2(\Omega) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C_3 = C_3(\Omega, N) > 0$ such that for any $u \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ it holds

$$C_2 \int_\Omega u^2 dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx \geq \frac{N^2}{4} \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx + C_3 \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2 \log^2(R_\Omega/|x|)} dx. \tag{1.7}$$

In view of these, let us now describe the content of the paper.

In Section 2, we firstly introduce the functional framework induced by the above Hardy inequalities. We refer to the Hilbert space H_λ defined in Subsection 2.1. Then we check the validity of the Pohozaev identity for the Schrödinger operator A_λ in this functional setting as follows. The domain of A_λ is defined by

$$D(A_\lambda) := \{u \in H_\lambda \mid A_\lambda u \in L^2(\Omega)\}, \tag{1.8}$$

and it holds

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma (x \cdot \nu) \Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = - \int_\Omega (x \cdot \nabla u) A_\lambda u dx - \frac{N-2}{2} ||u||^2_{H_\lambda}, \quad \forall\ u \in D(A_\lambda), \tag{1.9}$$

where $||\cdot||_{H_\lambda}$ denotes the norm associated to H_λ and We refer to Theorems 2.1, 2.2 for a complete statement of this result. For the sake of clarity, we will mainly discuss the case C1 above. Nevertheless, similar results could be also extended to the case C2 in a weaker functional setting due to weaker Hardy inequalities (see Subsection 2.3).

Formally, identity (1.9) can be obtained by direct integrations. However, this is not rigorously allowed because the lack of regularity of A_λ at the origin, otherwise the potential $1/|x|^2$ is bounded and the standard elliptic regularity applies. In addition, we need to justify the integrability of the boundary term in (1.9) which is no more obvious since the singularity is located on the boundary and standard trace regularity does not applies. As we mentioned before, we give a rigorous justification of these facts in Theorems 2.1, 2.2.

Pohozaev type identities arise in many applications and mostly when studying non-linear equations (see [13], [21], [11] and references therein).

In Section 2.2, we apply Theorem 2.2 to characterize the existence of non-trivial solutions to a semi-linear singular elliptic PDE in star-shaped domains. We refer mainly to Theorem 2.3.

In Section 3 we present some applications of Theorem 2.2 in Controllability of conservative systems like wave and Schrödinger equations, for which the multiplier method plays a crucial role.

In the last few decades, most of the studies in Controllability Theory and its applications to evolution PDEs, have applied methods like *Hilbert Uniqueness Method* (HUM) introduced by J. L. Lions in [27], Carleman estimates developed by Fursikov and Imanuvilov [18], microlocal analysis due to Bardos, Lebeau and Rauch ([4], [3]), but also multiplier techniques with the pioneering papers by Komornik and Zuazua ([24], [25], [37]). In particular, the controllability properties and stabilization of the heat like equation corresponding to A_λ have been analyzed in [33], [12], [32] in the case of interior singularity using tools like multiplier techniques and Carleman estimates.

Now, let us detail the problem we are interested in Section 3. For $N \geq 1$ we consider a bounded smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ where Γ denotes its boundary. Moreover, we state by Γ_0 a non-empty part of the set Γ that will be precise later.

Next we consider the Wave-like process

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u - \lambda \frac{u}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ u(t,x) = h(t,x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Gamma_0, \\ u(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ u_t(0,x) = u_1(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

To make the problem under consideration precise we say that the system (1.10) is exactly controllable from Γ_0, in time T, if for any initial data $(u_0, u_1) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H_\lambda^{'}$ and any target $(\overline{u_0}, \overline{u_1}) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H_\lambda^{'}$, there exists a control $h \in L^2((0,T) \times \Gamma_0)$ such that the solution of (1.10) satisfies:

$$(u_t(T,x), u(T,x)) = (\overline{u_1}(x), \overline{u_0}(x)) \quad \text{ for all } x \in \Omega.$$

This issue was analyzed by Vancostenoble and Zuazua [34] under the assumption that the singularity $x = 0$ is located in the interior of Ω. They proved well-posedness and exact controllability of the system (1.10) for any $\lambda \leq \lambda_\star := (N-2)^2/4$ from the boundary observability region Γ_0 described by

$$\Gamma_0 := \{x \in \Gamma \mid x \cdot \nu \geq 0\}. \tag{1.11}$$

Roughly speaking, the authors showed in [34] that the parameter $\lambda_\star$ is critical when asking the well-posedness and control properties of (1.10), and the results are very much related to the best constant in the Hardy inequality with interior singularity.

In Section 3, we address the same controllability question in the case of boundary singularity. Our main result asserts that for the same geometrical setup (1.11), we can increase the range of values λ (from $\lambda_\star$ to $\lambda(N) := N^2/4$) for which the exact boundary controllability of system (1.10) holds. This is due to the new Hardy inequalities above.

By now classical HUM, the Controllability of system (1.10) is equivalent to so-called *Observability Inequality* for the adjoint system,

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt} - \Delta v - \lambda \frac{v}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ v(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Gamma, \\ v(0,x) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ v_t(0,x) = v_1(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

which formally states that for any $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$ and $T > 0$ large enough there exists a constant $C_T > 0$ such that

$$C_T \Big(||v_1||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_\Omega \Big[|\nabla v_0(x)|^2 - \lambda \frac{v_0^2(x)}{|x|^2} \Big] dx \Big) \leq \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x \cdot \nu) \Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \Big)^2 d\sigma dt, \tag{1.13}$$

holds true for v solution of (3.8). The main tool to prove (1.13) relies on the multiplier method and compactness-uniqueness argument [27]. In view of that, Pohozaev identity provides a direct tool to show that the solution of system (3.8) satisfies the multiplier identity which formally is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\Gamma (x \cdot \nu) \Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \Big)^2 d\sigma dt = \frac{T}{2} (||v_1||^2_{L^2(|\Omega)} + ||v_0||^2_{H_\lambda}) + \int_\Omega v_t \big(x \cdot \nabla v + \frac{N-1}{2} v \big) \Big|_0^T dx, \tag{1.14}$$

producing a "Hidden regularity" efect for the normal derivative. We refer to Theorem 3.2 for a rigorous statement. As a consequence, the solution of system (3.8) verifies the reverse Observability inequality. Then identity (1.14) together with the sharp-Hardy inequality stated in Theorem 1.1 lead to *Observability inequality* (1.13), fact emphasized in Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume Ω satisfies one of the cases C1-C2 . Then, there exists a constant $C = C(\Omega) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega |x|^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx \leq R_\Omega^2 \Big[\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2 dx - \frac{N^2}{4} \int_\Omega \frac{v^2}{|x|^2} dx \Big] + C \int_\Omega v^2 dx \quad \forall v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \tag{1.15}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in the Appendix.

Remark 1.1. *The result of Theorem 1.1, and precisely the constant R_Ω^2 which appears in inequality* (1.15)*, helps to obtain the control time $T > T_0 = 2R_\Omega$ in* (1.13)*, which is sharp from the Geometric Control Condition considerations, see [4].*

Although Theorem 1.1 is sharp for our applications to controllability, it is worth mentioning that we are able to obtain a more general result as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume Ω satisfies one of the cases C1-C2. Let be $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, there exists a constant $C_\varepsilon = C(\Omega, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega |x|^\varepsilon |\nabla v|^2 dx \leq R_\Omega^\varepsilon \Big[\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2 dx - \frac{N^2}{4} \int_\Omega \frac{v^2}{|x|^2} dx \Big] + C_\varepsilon \int_\Omega v^2 dx \quad \forall v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \tag{1.16}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is omitted since it applies the same steps in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Finally in Section 3.2 we will consider the Schrödinger-like process

$$\begin{cases} iu_t - \Delta u - \lambda \frac{u}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Omega, \\ u(t,x) = h(t,x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Gamma_0, \\ u(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.17}$$

where the singularity is located on the boundary, and we briefly discuss the well-posedness and controllability properties. In Section 4 we treat with some open related problems.

The main results of this paper have been announced in a short presentation in [10].

2 Pohozaev identity for A_λ

In this Section we rigorously justify the Pohozaev-type identity associated to A_λ. We will discuss in a detail manner the case C1. The details of the case C2 are let to the reader. In the latter case we only state the corresponding functional framework, see Subsection 2.3.

2.1 The case C1

Firstly, we introduce the functional framework which is used throughout the paper and we discuss some of its properties.

Assume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$ is a smooth domain which satisfies the case C1 and fix $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. Thanks to inequality (1.6), we consider the Hardy functional

$$B_\lambda[u] = \int_\Omega \Big[|\nabla u|^2 - \lambda \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} \Big] dx, \tag{2.1}$$

which is positive and finite for all $u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. For any $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$, $B_\lambda[u]$ induces a Hilbert space H_λ, defined by the completion of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ functions in the norm

$$||u||^2_{H_\lambda} = B_\lambda[u], \quad u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \tag{2.2}$$

We point out that the space H_λ was firstly introduced by Vazquez and Zuazua [36] in the case of interior singularity. As emphasize above, it may be extended to the case of boundary singularity. In the subcritical case $\lambda < \lambda(N)$, it holds that $H_0^1(\Omega) = H_\lambda$, according to the estimates

$$\big(1 - \lambda/\lambda(N)\big) ||u||_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq ||u||^2_{H_\lambda} \leq ||u||^2_{H_0^1(\Omega)}, \quad \forall \quad u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

which ensure the equivalence of the norms.

The critical space $H_{\lambda(N)}$ turns to be slightly larger than $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Remark that $B_{\lambda(N)}[u]$ is finite for any $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, but it makes sense as an improper integral approaching the singular pole $x = 0$ (see the right hand side of (2.3)) for more general distributions. As happens in the case of interior singularity (see [35]), in general the meaning of $||u||_{H_{\lambda(N)}}$ does not coincide with the improper integral of $B_{\lambda(N)}[u]$. Following [35], we can construct a counterexample even in the case when the singularity is located on the border. Indeed, we fix $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ \ : \ |x'|^2 + (x_N - 1)^2 \leq 1\}$ and we consider the distribution $e_1 = x_N |x|^{-N/2} J(z_{0,1}|x|)$ where $z_{0,1}$ is the first positive zero of the Bessel function J_0. We observe that $B_{\lambda(N)}[u]$ is finite as an improper integral approaching the origin. On the other hand, computing we remark that

$$||e_1 - \phi||_{H_{\lambda(N)}} \geq C_0 > 0, \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),$$

for some positive universal constant $C_0 > 0$. This is in contradiction with the definition of $H_{\lambda(N)}$ which allows the existence of a sequence $\phi_n \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ converging to e_1 in $H_{\lambda(N)}$-norm ! Thererefore, the assumption of considering the definition of the $H_{\lambda(N)}$-norm as an improper integral of $B_{\lambda(N)}$ is false. In other words, there are distributions $u \in H_{\lambda(N)}$ for which

$$||u||^2_{H_{\lambda(N)}} \neq \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{|x| \geq \varepsilon} \Big[|\nabla u|^2 - \lambda(N) \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} \Big] dx. \tag{2.3}$$

Next we propose an equivalent norm on H_λ, $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$, which overcomes the anomalous behavior in (2.3) and describes perfectly the meaning of the H_λ-norm.

2.1.1 The meaning of H_λ-norm

For reasonable considerations that will be precise in (2.5), we introduce the functional

$$B_{\lambda,1}[u]=\int_\Omega\Big|\nabla u+\frac{N}{2}\frac{x}{|x|^2}u-\frac{e_N}{x_N}u\Big|^2dx+(\lambda(N)-\lambda)\int_\Omega\frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx. \tag{2.4}$$

which is positive and finite for any $u\in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\lambda\le\lambda(N)$. Here, we have denoted by e_N the $N-$th canonical vector of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Next, we observe that, for any $\lambda\le\lambda(N)$,

$$B_\lambda[u]=B_{\lambda,1}[u],\quad \forall u\in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \tag{2.5}$$

Besides, notice that both $B_{\lambda,1}[u]$ and $B_\lambda[u]$ are norms in H_λ and they coincide on $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. Due to definition (2.2) of H_λ, we conclude that the H_λ could be define as the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in the norm induced by $B_{\lambda,1}[u]$. Therefore, the H_λ-norm is characterized by the identification

$$||u||^2_{H_\lambda}=\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}B^\varepsilon_{\lambda,1}[u],\quad \forall u\in H_\lambda, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\lambda\le\lambda(N)$ and

$$B^\varepsilon_{\lambda,1}[u]:=\int_{|x|\ge\varepsilon}\Big|\nabla u+\frac{N}{2}\frac{x}{|x|^2}u-\frac{e_N}{x_N}u\Big|^2dx+(\lambda(N)-\lambda)\int_{|x|\ge\varepsilon}\frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx,\quad \forall u\in H_\lambda.$$

Next in the paper we will understand the meaning of the norm $||\cdot||_{H_\lambda}$ as in formula (2.6).

2.1.2 Main results

First of all, we note that standard elliptic estimates do not apply for A_λ to obtain enough regularity for the normal derivative since the singularity $x=0$ is located on the boundary. However, the following trace regularity result stated in Theorem 2.1 holds true. In what follows, $D(A_\lambda)$ stands for the domain of A_λ defined in (1.8).

Next, we claim the main results of Section 2.

Theorem 2.1 (Trace regularity). *Assume $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^N$, $N\ge1$, is a bounded smooth domain satisfying the case C1. Let us consider $\lambda\le\lambda(N)$ and $u\in D(A_\lambda)$. Then*

$$\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2|x|^2\in L^1(\Gamma), \tag{2.7}$$

and moreover, there exists a positive constant $C=C(\Omega)>0$ such that

$$\int_\Gamma\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2|x|^2d\sigma\le C(||u||^2_{H_\lambda}+||A_\lambda u||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}),\quad\forall\quad u\in D(A_\lambda). \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover, we obtain the following

Theorem 2.2 (Pohozaev identity). *Assume $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^N$, $N\ge1$, is a smooth bounded domain satisfying the case C1 and let $\lambda\le\lambda(N)$. If $u\in D(A_\lambda)$ we claim that*

$$\frac12\int_\Gamma(x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2d\sigma=-\int_\Omega A_\lambda u(x\cdot\nabla u)dx-\frac{N-2}{2}||u||^2_{H_\lambda}, \tag{2.9}$$

The proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2 are quite technical, so we need to apply some preliminary lemmas which are stated below. The proofs of Lemmas 2.1, 2.3 are postponed at the end of Subsection 2.1 while Lemma 2.2 is a consequence of an abstract approximation lemma in a forthcoming work [1].

Lemma 2.1. *Supppose $u \in D(A_\lambda)$ and denote $f = A_\lambda u \in L^2(\Omega)$. Let us also consider $\theta_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, a family of cut-off functions such that*

$$\theta_\varepsilon(x) = \theta_\varepsilon(|x|) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0, & |x| \leq \varepsilon \\ 1, & |x| \geq 2\varepsilon. \end{array} \right. \tag{2.10}$$

Assume $\vec{q} \in (C^2(\overline{\Omega}))^N$ is a vector field such that $\vec{q} = \nu$ on Γ, where ν denotes the outward normal to the boundary Γ (such an election of $\vec{q}$ can be always done in smooth domains, see [27], Lemma 3.1, page 29). Then we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\right)^2 |x|^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma = &- \int_\Omega f(|x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla u \theta_\varepsilon) dx + 2\int_\Omega (x \cdot \nabla u)(\vec{q} \cdot \nabla u)\theta_\varepsilon dx \\ &+ \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_\Omega u_{x_i} u_{x_j} |x|^2 q^j_{x_i} \theta_\varepsilon dx - \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \vec{q})\theta_\varepsilon dx \\ &- \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega div\vec{q}|x|^2 \Big[|\nabla u|^2 - \lambda \frac{u^2}{|x|^2}\Big]\theta_\varepsilon dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla \theta_\varepsilon \Big[|\nabla u|^2 - \lambda \frac{u^2}{|x|^2}\Big] dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega |x|^2 (\vec{q} \cdot \nabla u)(\nabla u \cdot \nabla \theta_\varepsilon) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Lemma 2.2. *Assume $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ verifying the case C1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough. We consider the following approximation problem*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} A_{\lambda(N)-\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon = f, & x \in \Omega \\ u_\varepsilon = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{array} \right. \tag{2.12}$$

Then

$$u_\varepsilon \to u \quad \text{strongly in } H_{\lambda(N)}, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

where u verifies the limit problem

$$-\Delta u - \lambda(N)\frac{u}{|x|^2} = f, \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

Moreover,

$$\varepsilon \int_\Omega \frac{u_\varepsilon^2}{|x|^2} dx \to 0, \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{2.13}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Assume Ω fulfills the case C1 and let $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. Let $f \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. Moreover, we assume that u_λ solves the problem*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} A_\lambda u_\lambda = f, & x \in \Omega, \\ u_\lambda \in H_\lambda. \end{array} \right. \tag{2.14}$$

Then u_λ satisfies the following upper bounds: there exists $r_0 < R_\Omega$ small enough and there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$, independent of λ, such that

$$|u_\lambda(x)| \leq C_1 x_N |x|^{-N/2+\sqrt{\lambda(N)-\lambda}} \Big|\log\frac{1}{|x|}\Big|^{1/2}, \quad a.e.\ x \in \Omega_{r_0}, \tag{2.15}$$

$$|\nabla u_\lambda(x)| \leq C_2 |x|^{-N/2+\sqrt{\lambda(N)-\lambda}} \Big|\log\frac{1}{|x|}\Big|^{1/2}, \quad a.e.\ x \in \Omega_{r_0}, \tag{2.16}$$

where $\Omega_{r_0} := \Omega \cap B_{r_0}(0)$.

Notation: In order to facilitate the computations, in the sequel, we will write " $\gtrsim$ " and " $\lesssim$ " instead of " $\geq C$" respectively " $\leq C$" when we refer to universal constants C.

2.1.3 Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Following the proof of Theorem 1.1, we are able to show that,

$$\int_\Omega |x||\nabla u|^2 dx \lesssim ||u||^2_{H_\lambda}, \quad \forall\ u \in H_\lambda. \tag{2.17}$$

From the above estimate and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality applied to identity (2.11) in Lemma 2.1 we reach to

$$\int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma \lesssim ||u||^2_{H_\lambda} + ||f||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall \quad u \in D(A_\lambda), \quad \forall \quad \varepsilon > 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Thanks to Fatou Lemma we finish the proof of Theorem 2.1.

□

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We split the proof in two main steps.

Step 1. The subcritical case

Note that $H_\lambda = H^1_0(\Omega)$. Let $u \in D(A_\lambda)$ and put $f := A_\lambda u \in L^2(\Omega)$. By standard elliptic estimates we note that $u \in H^2(\Omega \setminus B_\varepsilon(0))$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Moreover, the normal derivative $\partial u/\partial \nu \in L^2_{loc}(\partial\Omega \setminus \{0\})$. We multiply $A_\lambda u$ by $x \cdot \nabla u \theta_\varepsilon$, where θ_ε, $\varepsilon > 0$, was defined in (2.10). After integration we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma = &-\int_\Omega f(x\cdot\nabla u)\theta_\varepsilon dx - \frac{N-2}{2}\int_\Omega \Big[|\nabla u|^2 - \lambda\frac{u^2}{|x|^2}\Big]\theta_\varepsilon dx \\ &- \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \Big[|\nabla u|^2 - \lambda\frac{u^2}{|x|^2}\Big] x\cdot\nabla\theta_\varepsilon dx + \int_\Omega (x\cdot\nabla u)(\nabla u\cdot\nabla\theta_\varepsilon)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Combining the Dominated Convergence Theorem (DCT) with Theorem 2.1, the left hand side of (2.19) converges i.e.

$$\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma \to \int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma, \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

In the right hand side, we can directly pass to the limit term by term to obtain the identity (2.9) as follows. Firstly, since $x\cdot\nabla u \in L^2(\Omega)$ we have that

$$\begin{cases} |f(x\cdot\nabla u)\theta_\varepsilon| \le |f||x\cdot\nabla u| \in L^1(\Omega), \\ \theta_\varepsilon \to 1, \text{ a.e. as} \varepsilon \to 0, \end{cases}$$

and by DCT we obtain

$$\int_\Omega f(x\cdot\nabla u)\theta_\varepsilon dx \to \int_\Omega f(x\cdot\nabla u)dx, \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Besides, from Hardy inequality and DCT we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2\theta_\varepsilon dx \to \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2}\theta_\varepsilon dx \to \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx, \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Using the fact that $|\nabla\theta_\varepsilon| = O(1/\varepsilon)$ it follows that

$$\Big|\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 x\cdot\nabla\theta_\varepsilon dx\Big| \lesssim \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}\setminus B_\varepsilon} |\nabla u|^2 dx \to 0,$$

$$\Big|\int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} x\cdot\nabla\theta_\varepsilon dx\Big| \lesssim \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}\setminus B_\varepsilon} \frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx \to 0,$$
$$\Big|\int_\Omega (x\cdot\nabla u)(\nabla u\cdot\nabla\theta_\varepsilon)dx\Big| \lesssim \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}\setminus B_\varepsilon} |\nabla u|^2 dx \to 0,$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. With these we conclude the solvability of Theorem 2.2 in the subcritical case $\lambda < \lambda(N)$.

Step 2. The critical case $\lambda = \lambda(N)$

As before, let us consider $u \in D(A_{\lambda(N)})$ and $f := A_{\lambda(N)}u \in L^2(\Omega)$. Our purpose is to show the validity of Theorem 2.2 for such u.

We proceed by approximations with subcritical values. More precisely, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} A_{\lambda(N)-\varepsilon}u_\varepsilon = f, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ u_\varepsilon \in H_0^1(\Omega). \end{cases} \tag{2.20}$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$u_\varepsilon \to u \text{ in } H_{\lambda(N)}, \quad \varepsilon\int_\Omega \frac{u_\varepsilon^2}{|x|^2}dx \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{2.21}$$

where u solves the limit problem. According to the Pohozaev identity applied to u_ε we reach to

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = -\int_\Omega f(x\cdot\nabla u_\varepsilon)dx - \frac{N-2}{2}\Big(||u_\varepsilon||^2_{H_{\lambda(N)}} + \varepsilon\int_\Omega \frac{u_\varepsilon^2}{|x|^2}dx\Big). \tag{2.22}$$

Due to Theorem 1.1, the fact that $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $H_{\lambda(N)}$ implies

$$x\cdot\nabla u_\varepsilon \to x\cdot\nabla u \ \text{ in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Therefore, the right hand side in (2.22) converges to

$$-\int_\Omega f(x\cdot\nabla u)dx - \frac{N-2}{2}||u||^2_{H_{\lambda(N)}} := H(u),$$

and therefore

$$\text{there exists } \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = H(u).$$

On the other hand, by standard elliptic regularity one can show that

$$\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial\nu} \to \frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu} \text{ in } L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Gamma\setminus\{0\}) \text{ and } \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial\nu} \to \frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu} \text{ a.e. on } \Gamma.$$

In the sequel, we discuss two different situations for the geometry of Ω.

Case 1. Assume Ω is flat in a neighborhood of zero (i.e. $x\cdot\nu = 0$). Then it easily to note that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = \int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma.$$

In consequence, u satisfies the Pohozaev identity, by passing to the limit in (2.22).

Case 2. We assume Ω is not necessary flat at origin. We distinguish two cases when discussing the smoothness of f.

The case $f \in C^\infty(\Omega)$.
Next we apply Lemma 2.3 for u_ε the solution of problem (2.20). and we obtain

$$\Big|(x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2\Big| \leq \Big(\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 \leq g, \text{ a.e. on } \Gamma,$$

where $g = |x|^{2-N}\Big|\log\frac{1}{|x|}\Big| \in L^1(\Gamma)$. Applying DCT we conclude

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = \int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma.$$

The case $f \in L^2(\Omega)$.

We consider $\{f_k\}_{k\geq 1} \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $f_k \to f$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, as $k\to\infty$.

Let us call u_k the solution of $A_{l(N)}u_k = f_k$, for all $k \geq 1$. From the previous case, u_k satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = -\int_\Omega f_k(x\cdot\nabla u_k)dx - \frac{N-2}{2}||u_k||^2_{H_\lambda}. \tag{2.23}$$

We know that f_k is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Omega)$, and due to

$$||u_k - u_l||_{H_\lambda(N)} \lesssim ||f_k - f_l||_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0, \text{ as } k, l \to \infty,$$

we deduce that $\{u_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is Cauchy in $H_{\lambda(N)}$. Hence $u_k \to u$ in $H_{\lambda(N)}$ and

$$x\cdot\nabla u_k \to x\cdot\nabla u \text{ in } L^2(\Omega).$$

As a consequence we can pass to the limit in the right hand side of (2.23). In order to finish the proof, next we also show we can also pass to the limit in the left hand side. Indeed, in view of Theorem 2.1 we have

$$\int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial(u_k - u_l)}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 d\sigma \lesssim ||u_k - u_l||^2_{H_\lambda} + ||f_k - f_l||_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore $g_k := \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \nu}|x|$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Gamma)$ and $g_k \to g := \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}|x|$ in $L^2(\Gamma)$, as k goes to infinity. This suffices to say that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = \int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma.$$

Therefore we conclude the proof of Theorem 2.2. □

2.1.4 Proofs of useful lemmas

Proof of Lemma 2.1. By standard elliptic estimates, we remark that $u \in H^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega \setminus \{0\})$. Thanks to that, after multiplying f by $|x|\vec{q}\cdot\nabla u\theta_\varepsilon$ we are allowed to integrate by parts on Ω. Firstly, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \Delta u(|x|^2\vec{q}\cdot\nabla u\theta_\varepsilon)dx = \int_\Gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(|x|^2\vec{q}\cdot\nabla u\theta_\varepsilon)d\sigma - \int_\Omega \nabla u\cdot\nabla(|x|^2\vec{q}\cdot\nabla u\theta_\varepsilon)dx.$$

Let us now compute the boundary term above. Since u vanishes on Γ it follows that

$$\nabla u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\nu, \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \tag{2.24}$$

and moreover, $\vec{q} = \nu$ on Γ. Thanks to these we obtain

$$\int_\Gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(|x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla u \theta_\varepsilon) d\sigma = \int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \Delta u (|x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla u \theta_\varepsilon) dx = {} & \int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma - \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla (|x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla u) \theta_\varepsilon \\ & - \int_\Omega |x|^2 (\vec{q} \cdot \nabla u)(\nabla u \cdot \nabla \theta_\varepsilon) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Let us compute the second term in the integration above. Doing various iterations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla (|x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla u) \theta_\varepsilon = {} & 2 \int_\Omega (x \cdot \nabla u)(\vec{q} \cdot \nabla u) \theta_\varepsilon dx + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_\Omega u_{x_i} u_{x_j} |x|^2 q^j_{x_i} \theta_\varepsilon dx \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_\Omega |x|^2 q^j (u^2_{x_i})_{x_j} \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

For the last term in the integration above we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_\Omega |x|^2 q^j (u^2_{x_i})_{x_j} \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma = {} & \frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma - \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \vec{q}) \theta_\varepsilon dx \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \mathrm{div} \vec{q} |x|^2 |\nabla u|^2 \theta_\varepsilon dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |x|^2 |\nabla u|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla \theta_\varepsilon dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

According to (2.25) and (2.26) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \Delta u (|x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla u \theta_\varepsilon) dx = {} & \frac{1}{2} \int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 \theta_\varepsilon d\sigma - 2 \int_\Omega (x \cdot \nabla u)(\vec{q} \cdot \nabla u) \theta_\varepsilon dx \\ & - \sum_{i,j=1}^N \int_\Omega u_{x_i} u_{x_j} |x| q^j_{x_i} \theta_\varepsilon dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 (x \cdot \vec{q}) \theta_\varepsilon dx \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \mathrm{div} \vec{q} |x|^2 |\nabla u|^2 \theta_\varepsilon dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |x|^2 |\nabla u|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla \theta_\varepsilon dx \\ & - \int_\Omega |x|^2 (\vec{q} \cdot \nabla u)(\nabla u \cdot \nabla \theta_\varepsilon) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

On the other hand, it follows that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{u}{|x|^2} |x|^2 \vec{q} \cdot \nabla u \theta_\varepsilon dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \mathrm{div} \vec{q} u^2 \theta_\varepsilon dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \vec{q} \cdot \nabla \theta_\varepsilon u^2 dx. \tag{2.28}$$

From (2.27) and (2.28) we finally obtain the identity of Lemma 2.1. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 2.3. For any $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$ we fix $\phi_\lambda = x_N |x|^{-N/2 + \sqrt{\lambda(N) - \lambda}} \Big| \log \frac{1}{|x|} \Big|^{1/2}$. Let us also consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} A_\lambda U_\lambda = |f|, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ U_\lambda \in H_\lambda. \end{cases} \tag{2.29}$$

The proof follows several steps.

Step 1. Firstly let us check the validity of the Maximum Principle:

$$|u_\lambda(x)| \leq U_\lambda(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \tag{2.30}$$

Indeed, from the equations satisfied by U_λ, u_λ we obtain

$$-\Delta(U_\lambda \pm u_\lambda) - \lambda\frac{(U_\lambda \pm u_\lambda)}{|x|^2} = |f| \pm f \geq 0, \quad \forall\, x \in \Omega. \tag{2.31}$$

Multiplying (2.31) by the negative part $(U_\lambda \pm u_\lambda)^-$ we get the reverse Hardy inequality

$$\int_\Omega \Big[|\nabla(U_\lambda \pm u_\lambda)^-|^2 - \lambda\frac{[(U_\lambda \pm u_\lambda)^-]^2}{|x|^2}\Big]dx \leq 0. \tag{2.32}$$

From the non-attainability of the Hardy constant we necessary must have $(U_\lambda \pm u_\lambda)^- \equiv 0$ in Ω. Therefore, $U_\lambda \pm u_\lambda \geq 0$ in Ω, fact which concludes (2.30).

Step 2. Next, we remark that there exists a positive constant $C > 0$, independent of λ such that

$$-\Delta\phi_\lambda - \lambda\frac{\phi_\lambda}{|x|^2} \geq C_1, \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Therefore, for $C \geq ||f||_{L^\infty}/C_1$ we get

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta(C\phi_\lambda - U_\lambda) - \lambda\frac{(C\phi_\lambda - U_\lambda)}{|x|^2} \geq 0, & \forall x \in \Omega, \\ C\phi_\lambda - U_\lambda \geq 0, & x \in \Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{2.33}$$

Therefore, applying the Maximum Principle we obtain

$$U_\lambda \leq C\phi_\lambda, \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \quad \lambda \leq \lambda(N), \tag{2.34}$$

and the proof (2.15) is finished.

Step 3. For the estimate (2.16) we use a remark by Brezis-Marcus-Shafrir [7] as follows.

Fix $x \in \Omega_{r_0/2}$ and put $r = |x|/2$. We define then $\tilde{u}_\lambda(y) = u_\lambda(x + ry)$ where $y \in B_1(0)$. By direct computations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\tilde{u}_\lambda(y) &= r^2\Delta u_\lambda(x+ry) = r^2\Big(-f - \lambda\frac{u_\lambda(x+ry)}{|x+ry|^2}\Big) \\ &= -r^2 f - \lambda\frac{|x|^2}{4|x+ry|^2}\tilde{u}_\lambda(y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

On the other hand, we remark that

$$\frac{4}{9} \leq \frac{|x|^2}{|x+ry|^2} \leq 4, \quad \forall \quad y \in B_1(0).$$

By elliptic estimates it is easy to see that $\tilde{u}_\lambda \in C^1(B_1(0))$. Applying the interpolation inequality (see Evans [13]), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla\tilde{u}_\lambda(0)| &\lesssim ||\tilde{u}_\lambda||_{L^\infty(B_1(0))} + ||\Delta\tilde{u}_\lambda||_{L^\infty(B_1(0))} \\ &\lesssim ||\tilde{u}_\lambda||_{L^\infty(B_1(0))} + ||f||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

Writing $\nabla\tilde{u}_\lambda$ in terms of ∇u_λ we obtain

$$|\nabla u_\lambda(x)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x|}(||\tilde{u}_\lambda||_{L^\infty(B_1(0))} + ||f||_{L^\infty}) \tag{2.37}$$

In addition, from (2.34) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
||\tilde{u}_\lambda||_{L^\infty(B_1(0))} &= ||u_\lambda(x+ry)||_{L^\infty(B_1(0))}\\
&\lesssim \sup_{y\in B_1(0)}\left\{(x_N+ry_N)|x+ry|^{-N/2+\sqrt{\lambda(N)-\lambda}}\left|\log\frac{1}{|x+ry|}\right|^{1/2}\right\}\\
&\lesssim x_N|x|^{-N/2+\sqrt{\lambda(N)-\lambda}}\left|\log\frac{1}{|x|}\right|^{1/2}+|x|^{-(N-2)/2+\sqrt{\lambda(N)-\lambda}}\left|\log\frac{1}{|x|}\right|^{1/2}\\
&\lesssim |x|^{-(N-2)/2+\sqrt{\lambda(N)-\lambda}}\left|\log\frac{1}{|x|}\right|^{1/2}, \qquad (2.38)
\end{aligned}$$

which is verified for all $x\in\Omega_{r_0}$, $y\in B_1(0)$. From (2.37) and (2.38) we obtain the estimate (2.16) which yield the proof of Lemma 2.3. □

2.2 Applications to semi-linear equations

Pohozaev-type identities apply mostly to show non-existence results for elliptic problems. In what follow we emphasize a direct application to a non-linear elliptic equation with boundary singular potential. To fix the ideas, let us assume $\lambda<\lambda(N)$ and consider $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^N$, $N\geq 1$, a domain satisfying the case C1. Next

$$\alpha_\star := \frac{N+2}{N-2}$$

stands for the critical Sobolev exponent.

Next we claim

Theorem 2.3. *Let us consider the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \frac{\lambda}{|x|^2}u = |u|^{\alpha-1}u, & x\in\Omega,\\ u=0, & x\in\Gamma. \end{cases} \qquad (2.39)$$

1. *Assume $\lambda\leq\lambda(N)$. If $1<\alpha<\alpha_\star$ the problem* (2.39) *has non trivial solutions in H_λ. Moreover, if $1<\alpha<\frac{N}{N-2}$ the problem* (2.39) *has non trivial solutions in $D(A_\lambda)$.*
2. *(non-existence). Assume $\lambda\leq\lambda(N)$ and let Ω be a smooth star-shaped domain (i.e. $x\cdot\nu\geq 0$, for all $x\in\Gamma$). If $\alpha\geq\alpha_\star$ the problem does not have non trivial solutions in $D(A_\lambda)$.*

Proof of Theorem 2.3

Proof of 1. The existence of non trivial solutions for (2.39) reduces to study the minimization problem

$$I=\inf_{u\in H_\lambda, u\neq 0}\frac{||u||^2_{H_\lambda}}{||u||^{\alpha+1}_{L^{\alpha+1}(\Omega)}}.$$

Without losing the generality, we may consider the normalization

$$I=\inf_{||u||_{L^{\alpha+1}(\Omega)}=1} J(u), \qquad (2.40)$$

where $J: H_\lambda\to\mathbb{R}$, $J(u)=||u||^2_{H_\lambda}$ and we address the question of attainability of I in (2.40).

We note that J is continuous, convex, coercive in H_λ. Let $\{u_n\}_n$ be a minimizing sequence of I, i.e.,

$$J(u_n)\searrow I, \quad ||u_n||_{L^{\alpha+1}(\Omega)}=1.$$

By the coercivity of J we have

$$||u_n||_{H_\lambda}\leq C, \quad \forall n,$$

Moreover, the embedding $H_\lambda \hookrightarrow L^{\alpha+1}(\Omega)$ is compact for any $\alpha < \alpha_\star$ (it can be deduced combining Theorem 1.2 and Sobolev inequality). Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} u_n \rightharpoonup u & \text{weakly in } H_\lambda, \\ u_n \to u & \text{strongly in } L^{\alpha+1}(\Omega). \end{cases} \tag{2.41}$$

Therefore, $||u||_{L^{\alpha+1}(\Omega)} = 1$. From the i.s.c. of the norm we have

$$I \leq J(u) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} J(u_n) = I,$$

and therefore $I = J(u)$ is attained by u, which, up to a constant, is a non-trivial solution of (2.39) in H_λ.

If $\alpha < N/(N-2)$ let us show that $u \in D(A_\lambda)$. Indeed, due to the compact embedding $H_\lambda \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$, $q < 2N/(N-2)$, we have that $|u|^{\alpha-1}u \in L^2(\Omega)$. In consequence, $u \in D(A_\lambda)$. $\square$

Proof of 2. For the proof of the non-existence part we apply the Pohozaev identity in Theorem 2.2. In view of that we use the following lemma whose proof is postponed at the end of the section.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$ and $1 < \alpha < \infty$. Then, any solution $u \in D(A_\lambda)$ of (2.39) satisfies the identity*

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = \Big(\frac{N}{1+\alpha} - \frac{N-2}{2}\Big)\int_\Omega |u|^{\alpha+1}dx. \tag{2.42}$$

The case $\alpha > \alpha_\star$.

Note that $x\cdot\nu \geq 0$ for all $x \in \Gamma$. Assuming $u \not\equiv 0$, from Lemma 2.4 we obtain $(N-2)/2 \leq N/(\alpha+1)$ which is equivalent to $\alpha \leq \alpha_\star$. This is in contradiction with the hypothesis on α. Therefore $u \equiv 0$ in Ω.

The case $\alpha = \alpha_\star$.

From Lemma 2.4, due to the criticality of $\alpha_\star$, u must satisfy

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = 0.$$

We fix $\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ \mid |x'|^2 + (x_N - 1)^2 \leq 1\}$ which is star-shaped. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma.$$

Therefore, the problem in consideration is reduced to the overdetermined system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u - \frac{\lambda}{|x|^2}u = |u|^{\frac{4}{N-2}}u, & x \in \Omega, \\ u = 0, & x \in \Gamma, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0, & x \in \Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{2.43}$$

Let us consider a compact subset $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ such that $x\cdot\nu > 0$ and $0 \notin \Gamma'$. Next, we extend Ω with a bounded set Ω_1 such that $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega = \emptyset$, $\partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega = \Gamma'$, $\tilde\Omega := \Omega \cup \Omega_1$.
For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we denote the sets $\Omega_\varepsilon := \Omega \setminus \{x \in \Omega | \, |x| < \varepsilon\}$, $\tilde\Omega_\varepsilon := \tilde\Omega \setminus \{x \in \Omega \mid |x| < \varepsilon\}$.

Consider also the trivial prolongation of u to $\tilde\Omega$

$$\tilde u := \begin{cases} u, & x \in \Omega, \\ 0, & \Omega_1. \end{cases} \tag{2.44}$$

The fact that $u \in D(A_\lambda)$ combined with the over-determined condition in (2.43), imply that $u \in H^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$. Let us also show that $\tilde{u} \in H^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$.

Indeed, thanks to (2.43) on Γ_0 we get that

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon} \frac{d\tilde{u}}{\partial x_i}\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_j} dx = -\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon} g\phi dx, \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon), \tag{2.45}$$

where $g \in L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$ is given by

$$g = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}, & x \in \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ 0, & x \in \Omega_1. \end{cases} \tag{2.46}$$

In particular we obtain that

$$\Delta\tilde{u} = \begin{cases} \Delta u, & x \in \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ 0 & x \in \Omega_1. \end{cases} \tag{2.47}$$

and $\tilde{u}$ verifies

$$-\Delta\tilde{u} - \frac{\lambda}{|x|^2}\tilde{u} = |\tilde{u}|^{\frac{4}{N-2}}\tilde{u} \ \text{ a.e. in } \tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon \tag{2.48}$$

and $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$ in Ω_1. In other words we can write (2.48) as

$$-\Delta\tilde{u} = V(x)\tilde{u}, \quad x \in \tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon,$$

where $V(x) = \frac{\lambda}{|x|^2} + |\tilde{u}|^{\frac{4}{N-2}}$. Note that $V \in L^\omega(\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$ for some $\omega > N/2$ and $\tilde{u}$ vanishes in Ω_1.

With these we are in the hypothesis of the strong unique continuation result by Jerison and Kenig [23]. Therefore, $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$ in $\tilde{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ and in particular $u \equiv 0$ in Ω_ε, for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence, we conclude that $u \equiv 0$ in Ω. The proof of Theorem 2.3 is finished. □

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Since $u \in D(A_\lambda)$ we can apply the Pohozaev identity and we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial\Omega} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma = \int_\Omega -|u|^{\alpha-1}u(x\cdot\nabla u)dx - \frac{N-2}{2}||u||^2_{H_\lambda}, \tag{2.49}$$

Next we show that

$$\int_\Omega |u|^\alpha u(x\cdot\nabla u)dx = -\frac{N}{1+\alpha}\int_\Omega |u|^{\alpha+1}dx. \tag{2.50}$$

We proceed by approximation arguments. For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we consider $I_\varepsilon := \int_\Omega |u|^\alpha u(x\cdot\nabla u)\theta_\varepsilon dx$, where θ_ε is a cut-off function supported in $\Omega\backslash B_\varepsilon(0)$. Due to the fact that $u \in H^2(\Omega\backslash\{0\})$ we can integrate by parts as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} I_\varepsilon &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u|^{p-1}x\cdot\nabla(u^2)\theta_\varepsilon dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega u^2 \text{div}\big[|u|^{\alpha-1}x\theta_\varepsilon\big]dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega u^2\big[N|u|^{\alpha-1}\theta_\varepsilon + x\cdot\theta_\varepsilon|u|^{\alpha-1} + (\alpha-1)x\cdot\nabla u|u|^{\alpha-3}u\big]dx \\ &= \frac{N}{2}\int_\Omega |u|^{\alpha+1}\theta_\varepsilon dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u|^{\alpha+1}x\cdot\nabla\theta_\varepsilon dx - \frac{\alpha-1}{2}I_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$I_\varepsilon = \frac{N}{\alpha+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{\alpha+1}\theta_\varepsilon dx + \frac{1}{\alpha+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{\alpha+1}x\cdot\nabla\theta_\varepsilon dx. \tag{2.52}$$

From the equation itself it is easy to see that $|u|^{\alpha+1} \in L^1(\Omega)$ provided $u \in D(A_\lambda)$. Therefore, by the DCT we can pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in (2.52) to obtain the identity (2.50). On the other hand, multiplying (2.39) by u and integrating we obtain

$$||u||^2_{H_\lambda} = \int_\Omega |u|^{\alpha+1}dx,$$

Combining this with (2.50) and (2.49) we conclude (2.42). □

2.3 Brief presentation of the case C2

Inequalities (1.6), (1.7) can be stated in a simplified form as follows.

Assume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth bounded domain containing the origin on the boundary. For any $l \leq N^2/4$ and any $0 < \gamma < 2$ there exists a constant $C_1(\gamma, \Omega) \geq 0$ such that

$$\forall u \in H_0^1(\Omega), \qquad \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^\gamma} dx + l \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + C_1(\gamma, \Omega) \int_\Omega u^2 dx. \tag{2.53}$$

2.3.1 Functional framework via Hardy inequality

Let us now define the set

$$\mathcal{C} := \Big\{ C \geq 0 \ \text{ s. t. } \ \inf_{u \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \frac{\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla u|^2 - l(N) u^2/|x|^2 + C u^2 \right] dx}{\int_\Omega u^2/|x|^\gamma dx} \geq 1 \Big\}. \tag{2.54}$$

Of course, $\mathcal{C}$ is non empty due to inequality (2.53). Next we define

$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}} C. \tag{2.55}$$

Then, for any $\lambda \leq \lambda(N) = N^2/4$ we introduce the Hardy functional

$$B_\lambda[u] := \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx - \lambda \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx + \mathcal{C}_0 \int_\Omega u^2 dx, \tag{2.56}$$

which is positive for any $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ due to inequality (2.53) and the election of $\mathcal{C}_0$. Then we define the corresponding Hilbert space H_λ as the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in the norm induced by $B_\lambda[u]$. Observe that for any $\lambda < \lambda(N)$ the identification $H_\lambda = H_0^1(\Omega)$ holds true. Indeed, if $\lambda < \lambda(N)$, we have

$$B_\lambda[u] \geq \big(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda(N)}\big) \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{\mathcal{C}_0 \lambda}{\lambda(N)} \int_\Omega u^2 dx. \tag{2.57}$$

On the other hand, from the definition of $\mathcal{C}_0$ we obtain that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(\gamma) > 0$ such that

$$B_\lambda[u] \geq C_1 \int_\Omega u^2 dx. \tag{2.58}$$

Multiplying (2.58) by $\mathcal{C}_0 \lambda / (C_1 \lambda(N))$ and summing to (2.57) we get that

$$B_\lambda[u] \geq C_\lambda \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx,$$

for some positive constant C_μ that converges to zero as λ tends to $\lambda(N)$.

Besides, in the critical case $\lambda = \lambda(N)$, H_λ is slightly larger than $H_0^1(\Omega)$. However, using cut-off arguments near the singularity (see e.g. [36]) we can show that

$$B_\lambda[u]_{\lambda(N)} \geq C_\varepsilon ||u||_{H^1(\Omega \setminus B_\varepsilon(0))}, \quad \forall u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \tag{2.59}$$

where C_ε is a constant going to zero as ε tends to zero.

Let us define de operator $A_\lambda := -\Delta - \lambda/|x|^2 + \mathcal{C}_0 I$ and define its domain as

$$D(A_\lambda) := \{u \in H_\lambda \mid A_\lambda u \in L^2(\Omega)\}. \tag{2.60}$$

The norm of the operator A_λ is given by

$$||u||_{D(A_\lambda)} = ||u||_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||A_\lambda u||_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{2.61}$$

2.3.2 The meaning of the H_λ-norm

First of all we remark that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \frac{\Delta \Phi}{\Phi} u^2 dx = \int_\Omega \Big|\nabla u - \frac{\nabla \Phi}{\Phi} u\Big|^2 dx, \quad \forall\, u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega), \tag{2.62}$$

and any distribution satisfying $\Phi, 1/\Phi \in C^1(\Omega \setminus \{0\})$ and $\Phi > 0$ in Ω.

Let us also consider $\phi(x) = \phi(|x|) \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ to be a cut-off function such that

$$\phi = \begin{cases} 1, & |x| \leq r_0/2,\ x \in \Omega \\ 0, & |x| \geq r_0,\ x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.63}$$

where $r_0 > 0$ is aimed to be small.

Case 1.Assume the points on the boundary Γ of Ω satisfy $x_N > 0$ in a neighborhood of the origin.

We take $\Phi_1 = x_N |x|^{-N/2}$ which satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta \Phi_1 - \frac{N^2}{4} \frac{\Phi_1}{|x|^2} = 0, \qquad \text{a. e. in } \Omega_{r_0}, \tag{2.64}$$

where $\Omega_{r_0} := \Omega \cap B_{r_0}(0)$ for some $r_0 > 0$ small enough. From (2.62) and (2.64) we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\nabla v|^2 dx - \frac{N^2}{4} \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{v^2}{|x|^2} dx = \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \Big|\nabla v - \frac{\nabla \Phi_1}{\Phi_1} v\Big|^2 dx, \quad \forall\, v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_{r_0}). \tag{2.65}$$

By a standard cut-off argument, due to (2.65) we remark that, there exist some weights $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ depending on r_0, supported far from origin such that

$$\begin{aligned} B_\lambda[u] = &\int_\Omega \Big|\nabla(u\phi) - \frac{\nabla \Phi_1}{\Phi_1}(u\phi)\Big|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \rho_1 |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &+ (\lambda(N) - \lambda) \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx + \int_\Omega \rho_2 u^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

Then the meaning of $||\cdot||_{H_\lambda}$-norm is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||^2_{H_\lambda} = &\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{x \in \Omega, |x| > \varepsilon} \Big|\nabla(u\phi) - \frac{\nabla \Phi_1}{\Phi_1}(u\phi)\Big|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \rho_1 |\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &+ (\lambda(N) - \lambda) \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx + \int_\Omega \rho_2 u^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in H_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda \leq \lambda(N). \end{aligned} \tag{2.67}$$

Case 2. Assume the points on Γ satisfy $x_N \leq 0$ in a neighborhood of the origin

In this case we consider $d = (x, \Gamma) = d(x)$ the function denoting the distance from a point $x \in \Omega$ to Γ. We remark that close enough to origin the distribution

$$\Phi_2 = d(x) e^{(1-N)d(x)} |x|^{-N/2} \Big|\log \frac{1}{|x|}\Big|^{1/2},$$

satisfies

$$-\Delta \Phi_2 - \frac{N^2}{4|x|^2} \Phi_2 = P > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{r_0}$$

where $r_0 > 0$ is small enough.Due to this, there exist the weights $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ depending on r_0 and supported away from origin, such that the meaning of H_λ-norm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||^2_{H_\lambda} = &\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{x \in \Omega, |x| > \varepsilon} \Big|\nabla(u\phi) - \frac{\nabla \Phi_2}{\Phi_2}(u\phi)\Big|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \frac{P}{\Phi_2} |u\phi|^2 dx \\ &+ (\lambda(N) - \lambda) \int_\Omega \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} + \int_\Omega \rho_1 |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_\Omega \rho_2 u^2 dx, \quad \forall u \in H_\lambda, \quad \forall \lambda \leq \lambda(N). \end{aligned} \tag{2.68}$$

Case 3. Assume that x_N changes sign on Γ at the origin.

This case can be analyzed through Case 2 above.

Then, the Pohozaev identity and related results presented in case C1 might be extended to case C2 by means of the weaker functional settings introduced above.

3 Applications to Controllability

In this section we study the controllability of the wave and Schrödinger equations with singularity localized on the boundary of a smooth domain. Our motivation came through the results shown in [34] in the context of interior singularity.

For the sake of clarity, we will discuss in a detailed manner the case C1.

3.1 The wave equation. Case C1

In the sequel, we are focused to the controllability of the wave-like system

$$(W_\lambda): \begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u - \lambda \frac{u}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ u(t,x) = h(t,x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Gamma_0, \\ u(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ u_t(0,x) = u_1(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where $Q_T = (0,T) \times \Omega$, Γ denotes the boundary of Ω and Γ_0 is the boundary control region defined in (1.11), where the control $h \in L^2((0,T) \times \Gamma_0)$ is acting. We also assume $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. In view of the time-reversibility of the equation it is enough to consider the case where the target

$$(\overline{u_0}, \overline{u_1}) = (0,0).$$

It is the so-called *null controllability problem*.

3.1.1 Well-posedness

Let us briefly discuss the well-posedness of system (3.1) in the corresponding functional setting.

Instead of (1.10) we firstly consider the more general system with non-homogeneous boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u - \lambda \frac{u}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ u(t,x) = g(t,x), & (t,x) \in \Sigma_T, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ u_t(0,x) = u_1(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\Sigma_T = (0,T) \times \Gamma$. The solution of (3.2) is defined by the transposition method (J.L. Lions [27]):

Definition 3.1. *Assume $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. For $(u_0, u_1) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H'_\lambda$ and $g \in L^2((0,T) \times \Gamma)$, we say that u is a* **weak solution** *for (3.2) if*

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega u f dx = - < u_0, z'(0) >_{L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)} + < u_1, z(0) >_{H'_\lambda, H_\lambda} - \int_0^T \int_\Gamma g \frac{\partial z}{\partial \nu} \quad \forall \quad f \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega), \tag{3.3}$$

where $< \cdot, \cdot >$ represents the dual product between H_λ and its dual $H_\lambda^{'}$, and z is the solution of the non-homogeneous adjoint-backward problem

$$\begin{cases} z_{tt} - \Delta z - \lambda \frac{z}{|x|^2} = f, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ z(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in \Sigma_T, \\ z(T,x) = z'(T,x) = 0, & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

Formally, (3.3) is obtained by multiplying the system (3.4) with u and integrate on Q_T. Using the Hardy inequalities above and the application of standard methods for evolution equations we lead to the following existence result.

Theorem 3.1 (**well-posedness**). *Assume that Ω satisfies C1. Let $T > 0$ be given and assume $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. For every $(u_0, u_1) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H_\lambda^{'}$ and any $h \in L^2((0,T) \times \Gamma_0)$ there exists a unique weak solution of (1.10) such that*

$$u \in C([0,T]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0,T]; H_\lambda^{'}). \tag{3.5}$$

Moreover, the solution of (1.10) satisfies

$$||(u, u_t)||_{L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega) \times H_\lambda')} \lesssim ||(u_0, u_1)||_{L^2(\Omega) \times H_\lambda'} + ||h||_{L^2((0,T)\times\Gamma_0)}. \tag{3.6}$$

The details of the proof of Theorem 3.1 are omitted since they follow the same steps as in [34].

3.1.2 Controllability and main results

It is by now classical that controllability of (3.1) is characterized through an observability inequality for the adjoint system as follows below.

Given initial data $(u_0, u_1) \in L^2(\Omega) \times {H_\lambda}'$, a possible control $h \in L^2((0,T) \times \Gamma_0)$ must satisfy the identity

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} h \, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} d\sigma dt - < u_t(0), v(0) >_{H_\lambda', H_\lambda} + < u(0), v_t(0) >_{L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)} = 0, \tag{3.7}$$

where v is the solution of the adjoint system

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt} - \Delta v - \lambda \frac{v}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in \Sigma_T, \\ v(0,x) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ v_t(0,x) = v_1(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

The operator $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ defined by $\mathcal{A}_\lambda(w_1, w_2) = (w_2, \Delta w_1 + \lambda |x|^2 w_1)$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda) = D(A_\lambda) \times H_\lambda$, generates the wave semigroup i.e. $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda))$ is m-dissipative in $H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$. In view of that, due to the theory of semigroups, the adjoint system is well-posed and more precisely it holds that

Proposition 3.1 (see, e.g.[34]). *(1) For any initial data $(v_0, v_1) \in H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$ there exists a unique solution of (3.8)*

$$u \in C([0,T]; H_\lambda) \cap C^1([0,T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

Moreover,

$$||(v, v_t)||_{L^\infty(0,T; H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega))} \lesssim ||v_0||_{H_\lambda} + ||v_1||_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{3.9}$$

(2) For any initial data $(v_0, v_1) \in D(A_\lambda) \times H_\lambda$ there exists a unique solution of (3.8) such thar

$$v \in C([0,T]; D(A_\lambda)) \cap C^1([0,T]; H_\lambda) \cap C^2([0,T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

Moreover

$$||(v, v_t)||_{L^\infty(0,T; D(A_\lambda) \times H_\lambda)} \lesssim ||v_0||_{D(A_\lambda)} + ||v_1||_{H_\lambda} \tag{3.10}$$

In the sequel, we claim some "hidden regularity" effect for the system (3.8) which may not be directly deduce from the semigroup regularity but from the equation itself.

Theorem 3.2 (**Hidden regularity).** *Assume $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$ and v is the solution of* (3.8) *corresponding to the initial data $(v_0, v_1) \in H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$. Then v satisfies*

$$\int_0^T \int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt \lesssim \int_0^T \int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 |x|^2 d\sigma dt \lesssim ||v_0||^2_{H_\lambda} + ||v_1||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.11}$$

Moreover, v verifies the identity

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \int_\Gamma (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt = \frac{T}{2}(||v_0||^2_{H_\lambda} + ||v_1||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}) + \int_\Omega v_t\big(x\cdot\nabla v + \frac{N-1}{2}v\big)\Big|_0^T dx. \tag{3.12}$$

Due to Theorem 3.2 the operator $(v_0, v_1) \mapsto \big(\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)(\partial v/\partial\nu)^2 d\sigma dt\big)^{1/2}$ is a linear continuous map in $H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the completion of this norm in $H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$. We consider the functional $J : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$J(v_0, v_1)(v) := \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt - < u_1, v_0 >_{H'_\lambda, H_\lambda} + (u_0, v_1)_{L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{3.13}$$

where v is the solution of (3.8) corresponding to initial data (v_0, v_1). Of course, $< \cdot, \cdot >_{H'_\lambda, H_\lambda}$ denotes the duality product. A control $h \in L^2((0,T)\times\Gamma_0)$ satisfying (3.7) could be chosen as $h = (x\cdot\nu)v_{\min}$ where $v_{\min}$ minimizes the functional J on $\mathcal{H}$ among the solutions v of (3.8) corresponding to the initial data $(u_0, u_1) \in H'_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$ The existence of a minimizer of J is assured by the coercivity of J, which is equivalent to the *Observability inequality* for the adjoint system (3.8):

$$||v_0||^2_{H_\lambda} + ||v_1||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt, \tag{3.14}$$

Conservation of energy.

For any $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$ and any fixed time $t \geq 0$, let us define the energy associated to (3.8):

$$E^\lambda_v(t) = \frac{1}{2}\big(||v_t(t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda}\big) \tag{3.15}$$

We note that our system is conservative and therefore

$$E^\lambda_v(t) = E^\lambda_v(0), \quad \forall \lambda \leq \lambda(N), \quad \forall t \in [0,T].$$

Next we claim our main results which answer to the controllability question.

Theorem 3.3 (**Observability inequality).** *For all $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$, there exists a positive constant $D_1 = D_1(\Omega, \lambda, T)$ such that for all $T \geq 2R_\Omega$, and any initial data $(v_0, v_1) \in H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$ the solution of (3.8) verifies the observability inequality*

$$E^l_v(0) \leq D_1 \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt. \tag{3.16}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.3 relies mainly on the method of multipliers (cf. [27]) and the so called compactness uniqueness argument (cf. [28]), combined with the new Hardy inequalities above. These results guarantee the exact controllability of (1.10) when the control acts on the part Γ_0. In conclusion, we obtain

Theorem 3.4 (**Controllability).** *Assume that Ω satisfies C1 and $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. For any time $T > 2R_\Omega$, $(u_0, u_1) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H'_\lambda$ and $(\overline{u_0}, \overline{u_1}) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H'_\lambda$ there exists $h \in L^2((0,T)\times\Gamma_0)$ such that the solution of (1.10) satisfies*

$$(u_t(T,x), u(T,x)) = (\overline{u_1}(x), \overline{u_0}(x)) \quad \textit{for all } x \in \Omega.$$

3.1.3 Proofs of main results

First of all, we need to justify that the solution v of adjoint system (3.8) posses enough regularity to guarantee the integrability of the boundary term in (3.16). The justification is not trivial because the presence of the singularity at the boundary.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We will proceed straightforward from Theorem 2.2.

Firstly, we consider initial data (v_0, v_1) in $D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda) = D(A_\lambda) \times H_\lambda$. Then, according to Proposition 3.1 we have

$$v \in C([0,T]; D(A_\lambda)) \cap C^1([0,T]; H_\lambda) \cap C^2([0,T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

For a fixed time $t \in [0,T]$ we apply Theorem 2.2 for $A_\lambda v = -v_{tt}$ and we obtain

$$\int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}(x,t)\Big)^2 |x|^2 d\sigma \lesssim ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda} + ||v_{tt}(t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.17}$$

Integrating in time and if necessary in space we derive

$$\int_0^T \int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}(x,t)\Big)^2 |x|^2 d\sigma dt \lesssim \int_0^T ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda} dt + \int_\Omega v_t^2(T,x) dx - \int_\Omega v_t^2(0,x) dx. \tag{3.18}$$

According to the conservation of energy we reach to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_\Gamma \Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}(x,t)\Big)^2 |x|^2 d\sigma dt &\lesssim 2 \int_0^T E_v^\lambda(t) dt + E_v^\lambda(T) \\ &= (2T+2) E_v^\lambda(0) \\ &= (T+1)(||v_0||^2_{H_\lambda} + ||v_1||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Since $x \cdot \nu \lesssim |x|^2$ on Γ, from above we conclude the inequality (3.11).

Next, we apply the Pohozaev identity for $v(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$. Indeed, integrating in time in Theorem 2.2 for $A_\lambda v = -v_{tt}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\Gamma (x \cdot \nu) \Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt &= \int_\Omega v_t (x \cdot \nabla v)\Big|_0^T dx - \frac{N-2}{2} \int_0^T ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda} dt \\ &= \int_\Omega v_t (x \cdot \nabla v)\Big|_0^T dx - \frac{1}{2} \iint\limits_{Q_T} x \cdot \nabla (v_t^2) dx dt - \frac{N-2}{2} \int_0^T ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda} dt \\ &= \int_\Omega v_t (x \cdot \nabla v)\Big|_0^T dx + \frac{N}{2} \int_\Omega ||v_t(t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt - \frac{N-2}{2} \int_0^T ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda} dt \\ &= \int_\Omega v_t (x \cdot \nabla v)\Big|_0^T dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \big[||v_t(t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} dt + ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda}\big] dt \\ &+ \frac{N-1}{2} \int_0^T \big[||v_t(t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - ||v(t)||^2_{H_\lambda}\big] dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Multiplying the equation of $(W_\lambda)_{adj}$ by v and integrate in space, the equipartition of the energy

$$\int_\Omega v v_t \Big|_0^T dx = ||v_t(t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - ||v||^2_{H_\lambda},$$

holds true. Due to the conservation of energy and from relations above, we obtain precisely the identity (3.12). This yields the proof of Theorem 2.1 for initial data in the domain $D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda)$. Then, by density arguments, one can extend the results for less regular initial data $(v_0, v_1) \in H_\lambda \times L^2(\Omega)$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.3. In what follows we present the proof in the critical case $\lambda = \lambda(N)$, which is of main interest. The subcritical case $\lambda < \lambda(N)$ is let to the reader.

Step 1. Firstly, from Lemma 3.2 we remark that

$$\int_\Omega v_t(\frac{N-1}{2}v + x\cdot\nabla v)dx\Big|_0^T + TE_v^{\lambda(N)}(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\Gamma_0}(x\cdot\nu)(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu})^2 d\sigma dt. \tag{3.21}$$

For a fixed time $t = t_0 > 0$, by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_\Omega v_t\Big(\frac{N-1}{2}v + x\cdot\nabla v\Big)dx\Big|_{t=t_0} &\leq \frac{R_\Omega}{2}\int_\Omega v_t^2 dx + \frac{1}{2R_\Omega}\int_\Omega\Big(\frac{N-1}{2}v + x\cdot\nabla v\Big)^2 dx\\ &= \frac{R_\Omega}{2}||v_t||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{2R_\Omega}\Big[\Big(\frac{N-1}{2}\Big)^2||v||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||x\cdot\nabla v||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\quad + (N-1)\int_\Omega v(x\cdot\nabla v)dx\Big].\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand it follows

$$\int_\Omega v(x\cdot\nabla v)dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega x\cdot\nabla(v^2)dx = -\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \mathrm{div}(x)v^2dx = -\frac{N}{2}\int_\Omega v^2dx$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\Big|\int_\Omega v_t\Big(\frac{N-1}{2}v + x\cdot\nabla v\Big)dx\Big|_{t=t_0} \leq \frac{1}{2R_\Omega}||x\cdot\nabla v||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{R_\Omega}{2}||v_t||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - \frac{1}{2R_\Omega}\Big(\frac{N^2-1}{4}\Big)||v||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

Applying Theorem 3.3 we deduce

$$\Big|\int_\Omega v_t\Big(\frac{N-1}{2}v + x\cdot\nabla v\Big)dx\Big|_{t=t_0} \leq R_\Omega E_v^{\lambda(N)}(t_0) - C||v(t_0)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{3.22}$$

for some constant C. Due to the conservation of the energy and taking $t_0 = 0$ respectively $t_0 = T$ and summing in (3.22) we get

$$\Big|\int_\Omega v_t\Big(\frac{N-1}{2}v + x\cdot\nabla v\Big)dx\Big|_{t=0}^{t=T}\Big| \leq 2R_\Omega E_v^{\lambda(N)}(0) - C(||v(0)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||v(T)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}), \tag{3.23}$$

From (3.21) and (3.23) we obtain

$$(T - 2R_\Omega)E_v^{\lambda(N)}(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{\Gamma_0}(x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt + C(||v(0)||^2_{L^2} + ||v(T)||^2_{L^2}). \tag{3.24}$$

Step 2. To get rid of the remainder term at the right hand side of (3.24) we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a positive constant* $C = C(T,\Omega) > 0$ *such that*

$$||v(0)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||v(T)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\int_0^T\int_{\Gamma_0}(x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt \tag{3.25}$$

for all finite energy solution of (3.2).

Combining Lemma 3.1 with (3.24), the Observability inequality is finally proved. □

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We apply a classical compactness-uniqueness argument. Suppose by contradiction that (3.25) does not hold. Then there exists a sequence (v_0^n, v_1^n) of initial data such that the corresponding solution v^n verifies

$$\frac{||v^n(0)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||v^n(T)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}}{\int_0^T\int_{\Gamma_0}(x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v^n}{\partial\nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt} \to \infty.$$

Normalizing we may suppose that

$$||v^n(0)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||v^n(T)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1, \qquad \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v^n}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt \to 0. \tag{3.26}$$

From (3.24) we deduce that the corresponding energy is uniformly bounded. In particular, we deduce that v^n is uniformly bounded in

$$C([0,T]; H_{\lambda(N)}) \cap C^1([0,T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

Therefore, by extracting a subsequence

$$v^n \rightharpoonup v \text{ in } L^\infty(0,T; H_{\lambda(N)}) \text{ weakly-}\star, \tag{3.27}$$

From Theorem 2.1 we obtain

$$\frac{\partial v^n}{\partial \nu}\sqrt{x\cdot\nu} \rightharpoonup \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\sqrt{x\cdot\nu} \text{ in } L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Gamma_0)) \text{ weakly-}\star.$$

Furthermore, by lower semicontinuity,

$$0 \le \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v^n}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt = 0.$$

Hence

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x\cdot\nu)\Big(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big)^2 d\sigma dt = 0,$$

and

$$(x\cdot\nu)\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0, \qquad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma_0, \quad \forall t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.28}$$

On the other hand, from compactness we deduce that

$$v^n \to v \text{ in } L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega)),$$

which combined with (3.26) yield to

$$||v_0||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||v(T)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1. \tag{3.29}$$

To end the proof of Lemma 3.1 it suffices to observe that (3.28)-(3.29) lead to a contradiction. Indeed, in view of (3.28) and by Holmgreen unique continuation we deduce that $v \equiv 0$ in Ω which is in contradiction with (3.29). □

Remark 3.1. *Unique continuation results may be applied far from origin where coefficient of the lower order term of the operator $-\partial_{tt} - \Delta - \lambda/|x|^2$ is analytic in time (actually, it is independent of time and bounded in space). The principal part coincides with the D'Alambertian operator, then one can apply Homlgreen's unique continuation to get $v = 0$ a.e. in $\Omega \setminus B(0,\varepsilon)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. In consequence, we will have $v \equiv 0$ in Ω, see [29].*

3.2 The Schrödinger equation

In this section we consider the Schrödinger-like equation

$$\begin{cases} iu_t - \Delta u - \lambda \frac{u}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ u(t,x) = h(t,x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Gamma_0, \\ u(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.30}$$

Moreover, we assume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, is a smooth bounded domain satisfying case C1 and $\lambda \leq \lambda(N) := N^2/4$. For the Schrödinger equation we define the Hilbert spaces $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ and $H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ endowed with the inner products

$$< u, v >_{L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{C})} := \mathrm{Re} \int_\Omega u(x)\overline{v(x)}dx, \quad \forall u, v \in L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{C}),$$

$$< u, v >_{H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})} := \mathrm{Re} \int_\Omega \nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla \overline{v(x)}dx, \quad \forall u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C}).$$

For all $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$, we also define the Hilbert space $H_\lambda(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ as the completion of $H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ with respect to the norm associated with the inner product

$$< u, v >_{H_\lambda(\Omega;\mathbb{C})} := \mathrm{Re} \int_\Omega \big(\nabla u(x) \cdot \nabla \overline{v(x)} - \lambda \frac{u(x)\overline{v(x)}}{|x|^2}\big)dx, \quad \forall u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C}). \tag{3.31}$$

The spaces $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$, $H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$, $H_\lambda(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ inherit the properties of the corresponding real spaces. In order to simplify the notations, we will write $L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega), H_\lambda$ without making confusions.

As shown for the wave equation, the system (3.30) is well posed.

Theorem 3.5 (see [34]). *Let $T > 0$ be given and assume $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. For every $u_0 \in H_\lambda^{'}$ and any $h \in L^2((0,T) \times \Gamma_0)$ the system* (3.30) *is well-posed, i.e. there exists a unique weak solution such that*

$$u \in C([0,T]; H_\lambda^{'}).$$

Moreover, there exists constant $C > 0$ such that the solution of (S_λ) satisfies

$$||u||_{L^\infty(0,T;H_\lambda^{'})} \leq C(||u_0||_{H_\lambda^{'}} + ||h||_{L^2((0,T)\times\Gamma_0)}).$$

The system (3.30) is also controllable. More precisely, the control result states as follows.

Theorem 3.6. *The system (S_λ) is controllable for any $\lambda \leq \lambda(N)$. More precisely, for any time $T > 0$, $u_0 \in H_\lambda^{'}$ and $\overline{u_0} \in H_\lambda^{'}$ there exists $h \in L^2((0,T) \times \Gamma_0)$ such that the solution of (S_λ) satisfies*

$$u(T,x) = \overline{u_0}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega.$$

As discussed in Subsection 3.1, the controllability is equivalent to the Observability inequality for the solution of the adjoint system

$$\begin{cases} iv_t + \Delta v + \lambda \frac{v}{|x|^2} = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v(t,x) = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Gamma, \\ v(0,x) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.32}$$

More precisely, if v solves (3.32), then for any time $T > 0$, there exists a positive constant C_T such that

$$||v_0||_{H_\lambda}^2 \leq C_T \int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_0} (x \cdot \nu) \Big|\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big|^2 d\sigma dt. \tag{3.33}$$

Observability (3.33) might be deduced directly using the multiplier identity stated in Lemma 3.2. The proof is let to the reader since it follows the same steps in [34].

Lemma 3.2. *Assume $\lambda \leq \lambda_\star$ and v is the solution of* (3.32) *corresponding to the initial data $v_0 \in H_\lambda$. Then*

$$\int_0^T \int_\Gamma \Big|\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big|^2 |x|^2 d\sigma dt \lesssim ||v_0||_{H_\lambda}^2 \tag{3.34}$$

and v satisfies the identity

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \int_\Gamma (x \cdot \nu) \Big|\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\Big|^2 d\sigma dt = T||v||_{H_\lambda}^2 + \frac{1}{2} Im \int_\Omega v x \cdot \nabla \overline{v} dx \Big|_{t=0}^{t=T}.$$

Remark 3.2. *Besides, the proof of* (3.33) *can be deduced from the result valid for the wave equation. Indeed, the general theory presented in an abstract form in [31], assure the observability of systems like $\dot{z} = iA_0 z$ using results available for systems of the form $\ddot{z} = -A_0 z$.*

4 Open problems

1. Geometric constraints. In this paper we have shown the role of the Pohozaev identity, in the context of boundary singularities, when studying the controllability of conservative systems like Wave and Schrödinger equations. We proved that for any $\lambda \leq \lambda(N) = N^2/4$, the corresponding systems are exact observable from Γ_0 precised in (1.11). Our result enlarges the range of values $\lambda \leq (N-2)^2/4$ for which the control holds, proved firstly in [34] in the context of interior singularities.

The geometrical assumption for Γ_0 is really necessary, otherwise our proof does not work. Of course, it is still open to be analysed the case when the central of gravity of Γ_0 is centered at a point x_0 different by zero, i.e. $\Gamma_0 = \{x \in \Gamma \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu \geq 0\}$. This choice of Γ_0 provide some technical difficulties which have been also emphasized in [34]. En eventually proof in the case of a such domain Γ_0 should apply a different technique that we have used so far.

2. Multipolar singularities. The same Pohozaev identity and controllability issues could be address for more complicated operators, like for instance $L = -\Delta - V(x)$, where $V(x)$ denotes a multi-particle potential. To the best of our knowledge, even if there are some important works studying Hardy-type inequalities for multipolar potentials (see e.g. [6] et al.), an accurate analysis is still to be done. In a forthcoming work we study two particles systems. Our goal is to analyze the limit process when one particle collapses to the other. We apply this both in the context of controllability and the diffusion heat processes discussing the time decay of solutions.

5 Appendix: sharp bounds for $||x \cdot \nabla v(t)||_{L^2(\Omega)}$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Without losing the generality it is enough to consider two type of geometries for Ω as follows.

G1: The points on Γ satisfy $x_N \geq 0$ in the neighborhood of origin.

G2; The points on Γ satisfy $x_N < 0$ in the neighborhood of origin.

In the other intermediate case (when x_N changes sign at origin) the result valid for case G2 still holds true since we can prove it for test functions extended with zero up to a domain satisfying G2.

The proof follows several steps.

Step 1. Firstly we show that Theorem 1.1 is locally true. More precisely, there exists $r_0 = r_0(\Omega, N) > 0$ small enough, and $C = C(r_0)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx \leq R_\Omega^2 \Big[\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\nabla v|^2 dx - \frac{N^2}{4} \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{v^2}{|x|^2} dx \Big] + C(r_0) \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} v^2 dx, \tag{5.1}$$

holds true for any function $v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega_{r_0})$, where $\Omega_{r_0} = \Omega \cap B_{r_0}(0)$.

Next we check the validity of Step 1. For that let us consider a function ϕ which satisfies

$$-\Delta \phi \geq \frac{N^2}{4} \frac{\phi}{|x|^2}, \quad \phi > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{r_0},$$

for some positive constant r_0. Such a function exists for each one of the case G1-G2. Indeed, for the case G1 we may consider $\phi = x_N |x|^{-N/2}$ and for case G2 we can take
$\phi = d(x) e^{(1-N)d(x)} \Big| \log \frac{1}{|x|} \Big|^{1/2} |x|^{-N/2}$.

Next we introduce u such that $v = \phi u$. Then we get

$$|\nabla v|^2 = |\nabla \phi|^2 u^2 + \phi^2 |\nabla u|^2 + 2\phi u \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla u.$$

Next, integrating we get

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\nabla v|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\nabla u|^2 \phi^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{\Delta \phi}{\phi} v^2. \tag{5.2}$$

On the other hand, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 |\nabla \phi|^2 u^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 \phi^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 \nabla(\phi^2) \cdot \nabla(u^2) dx \tag{5.3}$$

Next we deduce

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 \nabla(\phi^2) \cdot \nabla(u^2) dx = -\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} 2 \frac{x \cdot \nabla \phi}{\phi} v^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 |\nabla \phi|^2 u^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{\Delta \phi}{\phi} |x|^2 v^2 dx. \tag{5.4}$$

According to (5.3) and (5.4) we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 \phi^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{2x \cdot \nabla \phi}{\phi} v^2 dx - \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{\Delta \phi}{\phi} |x|^2 v^2 dx. \tag{5.5}$$

Let us write

$$-\frac{\Delta \phi}{\phi} = \frac{N^2}{4|x|^2} + P, \tag{5.6}$$

where $P \geq 0$ for any $x \in \Omega_{r_0}$. Then from (5.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 \phi^2 |\nabla u|^2 dx &\leq R_\Omega^2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \phi^2 |\nabla u|^2 = R_\Omega^2 \Big[\int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{\Delta \phi}{\phi} v^2 \Big] \\ &= R_\Omega^2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \Big[|\nabla v|^2 - \frac{N^2}{4} \frac{v^2}{|x|^2} \Big] dx - R_\Omega^2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} P v^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

From above and (5.5) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} |x|^2 |\nabla v|^2 dx &\leq R_\Omega^2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \Big[|\nabla v|^2 - \frac{N^2}{4} \frac{v^2}{|x|^2} \Big] dx - R_\Omega^2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} P v^2 dx \\ &- 2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{x \cdot \nabla \phi}{\phi} v^2 dx + \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \Big(\frac{N^2}{4|x|^2} + P \Big) |x|^2 v^2 dx \\ &= R_\Omega^2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \Big[|\nabla v|^2 - \frac{N^2}{4} \frac{v^2}{|x|^2} \Big] dx + \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} (|x|^2 - R_\Omega^2) P v^2 dx \\ &- 2 \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} \frac{x \cdot \nabla \phi}{\phi} v^2 dx + \frac{N^2}{4} \int_{\Omega_{r_0}} v^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

In the case G1 for r_0 small enough we have $P = 0$ and

$$\Big| \frac{x \cdot \nabla \phi}{\phi} \Big| \leq C, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{r_0},$$

holds for some positive constant C. Thanks to (5.8) we conclude the proof of Step 1 in the cases G1.

In the case G2, for r_0 small enough we have

$$P > 0, \quad \nabla d \cdot x \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_{r_0}$$

Then, we remark

$$\frac{x\cdot\nabla\phi}{\phi}=\frac{x\cdot\nabla d}{d}+O(1),$$

and from above we also finish the proof of Step 1 in this case.

Step 2. This step consist in applying a cut-off argument to transfer the validity of inequality (5.1) from Ω_{r_0} to Ω. More precisely, we consider a cut-off function $\theta\in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\theta(x)=\begin{cases}1, & |x|\le r_0/2,\\ 0, & |x|\ge r_0.\end{cases}\tag{5.9}$$

Then we split $v\in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ as follows,

$$v=\theta v+(1-\theta)v:=w_1+w_2.$$

Next let us firstly prove the following lema.

Lemma 5.1. *Let us consider a weight function $\rho: C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})\to\mathbb{R}$ which is bounded and non negative. There exists $C(\Omega,\rho)>0$ such that the following inequality holds*

$$\int_\Omega\rho(x)\nabla w_1\cdot\nabla w_2dx\ge -C(\Omega,\rho,r)\int_\Omega|v|^2dx.\tag{5.10}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1. From the boundary conditions, integrating by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega\rho\nabla w_1\cdot\nabla w_2dx&=\int\rho\theta(1-\theta)|\nabla v|^2dx+\int_\Omega\rho v\nabla v\cdot\nabla\rho(1-2\theta)dx-\int\theta|\nabla\theta|^2|v|^2dx\\&\ge\frac12\int_{\Omega_{r_0}\setminus\Omega_{r_0/2}}\nabla(|v|^2)\cdot\nabla\theta(1-2\theta)\rho dx-||\rho||_\infty||D\theta||_\infty^2\int_\Omega|v|^2dx\\&=-\frac12\int_{\Omega_{r_0}\setminus\Omega_{r_0/2}}\operatorname{div}((1-2\theta)\rho\nabla\theta)|v|^2dx-||\rho||_\infty||D\theta||_\infty^2\int_\Omega|v|^2dx\\&\ge -C(||\rho||_{W^{1,\infty}},||\theta||_{W^{2,\infty}})\int_\Omega|v|^2dx.\end{aligned}\tag{5.11}$$

□

Now we are able to finalize the proof of Step 2. Indeed, splitting v as before we get

$$\int_\Omega|x|^2|\nabla v|^2dx=\int_{\Omega_{r_0}}|x|^2|\nabla w_1|^2dx+\int_{\Omega\setminus\Omega_{r_0/2}}|x|^2|\nabla w_2|^2dx+2\int_{\Omega_{r_0}\setminus\Omega_{r_0/2}}|x|^2\nabla w_1\cdot\nabla w_2dx$$

Applying (5.1) to w_1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega|x|^2|\nabla v|^2dx\le R_\Omega^2\Big[\int_\Omega|\nabla v|^2dx-\frac{N^2}{4}\int_\Omega\frac{w_1^2}{|x|^2}dx\Big]+C\int_\Omega v^2dx-\\-\int_{\Omega_{r_0}\setminus\Omega_{r_0/2}}2(R_\Omega^2-|x|^2)\nabla w_1\cdot\nabla w_2dx.\end{aligned}\tag{5.12}$$

Adding $\rho=2(R_\Omega^2-|x|^2))$ in Lemma 5.1, from (5.12) we get

$$\int_\Omega|x|^2|\nabla v|^2dx\le R_\Omega^2\Big[\int_\Omega|\nabla v|^2dx-\frac{N^2}{4}\int_{\Omega_{r_0}}\frac{w_1^2}{|x|^2}dx\Big]+C(\Omega,r_0)\int_\Omega v^2dx.\tag{5.13}$$

On the other hand we remark that

$$\int_{\Omega_{r_0}}\frac{w_1^2}{|x|^2}\ge\int_\Omega\frac{v^2}{|x|^2}dx-C(r_0)\int_\Omega v^2dx.\tag{5.14}$$

From (5.13) and (5.14) the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 yields choosing r_0 small enough, $r_0\le R_\Omega$. □

Acknoledgements The author wish to thank Enrique Zuazua and Adimurthi for useful suggestions and advices.

Partially supported by the Grants MTM2008-03541 and MTM2011-29306-C02-00 of the MICINN (Spain), project PI2010-04 of the Basque Government, the ERC Advanced Grant FP7-246775 NUMERIWAVES, the ESF Research Networking Program OPTPDE, the grant PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0075 of CNCS-UEFISCDI Romania and a doctoral fellowship from UAM (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid).

References

[1] Adimurthi, private communication.

[2] N. C. Adimurthi and M. Ramaswamy, An improved Hardy-Sobolev inequality and its application, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 130 (2002), no. 2, 489-505 (electronic).

[3] C. Bardos, G. Lebeau, and J Rauch, Microlocal ideas in control and stabilization, Control of boundaries and stabilization (Clermont-Ferrand, 1988), Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., 125, 14–30, Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[4] C. Bardos, G. Lebeau, and J. Rauch, Control and stabilization for hyperbolic equations. Mathematical and numerical aspects of wave propagation phenomena (Strasbourg, 1991), 252–266, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1991.

[5] H. Berestycki and M. J. Esteban, Existence and bifurcation of solutions for an elliptic degenerate problem, J. Differential Equations 134 (1997), no. 1, 1-25.

[6] R. Bosi, J. Dolbeault, and J. Esteban, M., Estimates for the optimal constants in multipolar Hardy inequalities for Schrödinger and Dirac operators, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 7 (2008), no. 3, 533-562.

[7] H. Brezis, M. Marcus, and I. Shafrir, Extremal functions for Hardy's inequality with weight, J. Funct. Anal. 171 (2000), no. 1, 177-191.

[8] H. Brezis and J. L. Vázquez, Blow-up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid 10 (1997), no. 2, 443-469.

[9] C. Cazacu, On Hardy inequalities with singularities on the boundary, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, 349, 2011, 273-277,

[10] C. Cazacu, Hardy inequality and Pohozaev identity for operators with boundary singularities: some applications, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, 349, 2011, 1167–1172.

[11] J. Dávila and I. Peral, Nonlinear elliptic problems with a singular weight on the boundary, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 41, 2011, 3-4, 567–586.

[12] S. Ervedoza, Control and stabilization properties for a singular heat equation with an inverse-square potential, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 33, 2008, 10-12, 1996–2019.

[13] L. C. Evans, Partial differential equations, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 19, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.

[14] M. M. Fall, On the Hardy Poincaré inequality with boundary singularities. Commun. Contemp. Math, to appear.

[15] M. M. Fall and R. Musina, Hardy-Poincaré inequality with boundary singularities. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh, to appear.

[16] S. Filippas, V. Maz'ya, and A. Tertikas, On a question of Brezis and Marcus, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 25 (2006), no. 4, 491-501.

[17] S. Filippas, V. G. Maz'ya, and A. Tertikas, Sharp Hardy-Sobolev inequalities, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 339 (2004), no. 7, 483-486.

[18] A. V. Fursikov, and O. Yu. Imanuvilov, Controllability of evolution equations, Lecture Notes Series, 34, Seoul National University Research Institute of Mathematics Global Analysis Research Center,Seoul, 1996.

[19] A. Tertikas , S. Filippas, and J. Tidblom, On the structure of Hardy-Sobolev-Maz'ya inequalities, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 11 (2009), no. 6, 1165-1185.

[20] J. P. García Azorero and A. I. Peral, Hardy inequalities and some critical elliptic and parabolic problems, J. Differential Equations 144 (1998), no. 2, 441-476.

[21] N. Ghoussoub and X. S. Kang, Hardy-Sobolev critical elliptic equations with boundary singularities, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 21, 2004, 6, 767–793.

[22] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, Inequalities, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988, Reprint of the 1952 edition.

[23] D. Jerison and C. E. Kenig, Unique continuation and absence of positive eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators, with an appendix by E. M. Stein, Ann. of Math. (2), 121, 1985, 3, 463-494.

[24] V. Komornik, Exact controllability and stabilization, RAM: Research in Applied Mathematics, The multiplier method, Masson, Paris, 1994,

[25] V. Komornik and E. Zuazua, A direct method for the boundary stabilization of the wave equation, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 69, 1990, 1, 33–54.

[26] J. M. Lévy-Leblond, Electron capture by polar molecules, Phys. Rev., 153, 1, 1967, 1–4.

[27] J.-L. Lions, Contrôlabilité exacte, perturbations et stabilisation de systèmes distribués. Tome 1, Recherches en Mathématiques Appliquées [Research in Applied Mathematics], 8, Contrôlabilité exacte. [Exact controllability], With appendices by E. Zuazua, C. Bardos, G. Lebeau and J. Rauch, Masson, Paris, 1988.

[28] E. Machtyngier, Exact controllability for the Schrödinger equation, SIAM J. Control Optim., 32, 1994, 1, 24–34.

[29] D. Tataru, Unique continuation for solutions to PDE's; between Hörmander's theorem and Holmgren's theorem, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 20, 1995, 5-6, 855–884.

[30] A. Tertikas, Critical phenomena in linear elliptic problems, J. Funct. Anal. 154 (1998), no. 1, 42-66.

[31] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss, Observation and control for operator semigroups, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. [Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks], Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009, xii+483.

[32] J. Vancostenoble, Lipschitz stability in inverse source problems for singular parabolic equations, preprint 2011.

[33] J. Vancostenoble, J. and E. Zuazua, Null controllability for the heat equation with singular inverse-square potentials, J. Funct. Anal., 254, (2008) (7), 1864-1902.

[34] J. Vancostenoble and E. Zuazua, Hardy inequalities, observability, and control for the wave and Schrödinger equations with singular potentials, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 41, 2009, 4, 1508-1532.

[35] J. L. Vázquez and N. B. Zographopoulos, Functional aspects of the Hardy inequality. Appearance of a hidden energy, http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.5661.

[36] J. L. Vázquez and E. Zuazua, The Hardy inequality and the asymptotic behaviour of the heat equation with an inverse-square potential, J. Funct. Anal. 173 (2000), no. 1, 103-153.

[37] E. Zuazua, Exact controllability for the semilinear wave equation, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 69, 1990, 1, 1–31.